p26

G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1910.
(municipal)

File No. 44

Serial Nos. 1—9

Papers Filed.

Month Sept. 02

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Bhaskariya ; Head Gumasta, Bo-
mane, against the order of the Commissio-
ner fixing his assessment in connection with the
enhancement of Octroi Revenue.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

LATER REFERENCES.

Indexed
B B Shanbhag

SECTION Minute

FILE NO 44 of 00 Note

Reference :- Correspondence ending with letter No C 1356 dated the 24th January 1902 from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, Submitting the records connected with the embezzlement of Octroi Revenue in the Chintamani Taluk Town.

In the months of June and July 1900, the Deputy Commissioner, and the General Assistant Commission Kolar District, received a number of petitions complaining among other things of the embezzlement of Octroi revenue in the Chintamani Town, and that Narayana Reddi, a Collector attached to the Sub Treasury at Chintamani

was at the bottom for this
This Collar was placed
under Suspension, and
the General Assistant
Commissioner (Mr V. N. Gopala
Iyengar), under the orders
of the Deputy Commissioner,
held preliminary enquiries
into the matter and re-
ported that a sum of
Rs 2386-5 out of the
collections of Octroi duty
on ~~piece goods~~ cloth had been
misappropriated between
July 1898 and July 1899,
major portion of which in
the months of March, April
and May '99, that the Octroi
Register Shewing the Kula-
war particulars of the
value of goods ~~passed~~ pre-
Sented and duty paid there
on by the merchants from
the 17th August 1898 up to
the 7th June 1899 was missing, that

that Gollan Narayana reddi should, probably, have it, that the gollan had been collecting the duty on his own responsibility without reference either to the Head Gumasta, or the Sheristedar, or the Amildar, that the Head Gumasta failed to check the collections with reference to the duplicate parties at the end of each month while preparing the monthly accounts.

2. On this report Mr Carr ordered the prosecution of the Gollan who was tried by the General Assistant Commissioner and 1st Class Magistrate (Mr C. Krishna Rau), who found guilty under Section 408 of the Indian Penal Code with reference to three items aggregating Rs 318-3, and fined Rs 50, but the conviction and the sentence were set aside

(5)

by the Chief Court.

3 Head Gumasta Bhaskaraya & 5
and Sheristedar N. Subba Rao
were fined Rs 50 and warned
for reduction by the
Dy Comr, for the reason
that the former was
so grossly negligent
as not to take the
slightest trouble in
checking the patties or
accounts before preparing
the monthly ~~returns~~ accounts
and that the latter should
also have satisfied himself
that the patties tallied into
the monthly Statements. The
Sheristedar was also transferred
as an additional punishment.

4 The Dy Comr called upon
Amildars Yello Srinivasa
Rao to shew cause why
he should not be re-
commended to Government
for a fine of Rs 100/- for
gross negligence in his work.
in not properly supervising

the Octroi collections. 5

5 Against this order of the Deputy Commissioner Head Gumasta Bhaskrayya and Amildar Yello Srinivasa appeal to Government.

6 Bhaskarayya's plea is as follows

That prior to 1st August 1896 the Judicial Gumasta was in charge of Octroi collections, that when the Amildar recommended that this Gumasta should be remunerated for this extra work, the Dy Commissioner ordered in July 1896 that this work should not be entrusted to minor officials and that the Amildar or the Sheristadar should look after it, that, accordingly, the Sheristadar has been in charge of this work ever since, that the petitioner was never entrusted with municipal work except

b

Correspondence bearing on ~~estimates~~ estimates for municipal works, that he was not entrusted with the preparation of Octroi monthly returns, that there is no connection whatever in the preparation of the accounts and the embezzlement of the Octroi Collections carried on in the daily transactions, that the monthly returns are prepared on the daily realizations credited into the Treasury but not on the lists of goods on which duty has been collected that as long as the Sheristadar who is the head of the Accounts Department and the petitioner's immediate superior was in charge of the Octroi Collection book, had the records and [illegible] with both hands

caused every day's collections to be remitted to the Treasury after verifying each day's vouchers, and signed the monthly returns prepared by the Municipal establishment after satisfying himself as to their correctness on comparing with the entries in his register, the Petitioner had neither the necessity for nor the facility in checking the duplicate parties while submitting the monthly returns, that no useful purpose could have been served though the returns had been prepared with the help of the said duplicates, as the embezzlement carried on was only brought to light on comparing the amount of duty entered on the original lists in the possession of merchants with the Treasury credits, that the monthly returns prepared by the

Municipal establishment used to be checked by comparing with the Treasury Credits and attested at times by the Petitioner and at others either by the Head Munshi or one of the Revenue Gumastas, and that the Deputy Commissioner has imposed a fine of Rs 50/- on the Petitioner on the strength of the memo of the General Assistant Commissioner who was prejudiced against him on the misrepresentation of the Sheristadar, who is influential, that the Head Gumasta was in charge of the Octroi collection and that the Collector was working under the Petitioner as his Assistant; and also on account of the ill-feeling by the General Assistant Commissioner towards the petitioner in connection with Amloar Rao the case chosen by

affair. The Head Gumasta Complains that his Representations were not considered by the Deputy Commissioner; and adds though he has been and is the Head Gumasta of the Taluk, he has never been entrusted with his legetimate duties, that the Revenue Gumastas have been doing their duties independent of him, and that his services have at times been utilized for Special works and at others he has had to wait upon the Amildar and do such work as he required of him.

7. In his deposition before the General Assistant Commissioner and 1st Class Magistrate, Shenstedar Subba Rao

first. Said that the Head Gumasta had been entrusted with Octroi work and then admitted that the Memo of the Amildar dated 20th October 1896 directed that the Sheristedar should be responsible for the Octroi work as it had already been entrusted to him.

Note. Mrs Shows that the Head Gumasta had nothing to do with the octroi collections

8. Amildar Yello Srinivasa Rao's deposition runs as follows:-

"As regards the work of Octroi work I directed my Sheristedar to personally see about the collections of Octroi only on his own responsibility. I don't remember of my ordering the accused (Collar Narayanareddi) to look after the Octroi duty Collection work. During my encumbency I don't

Know

——— Do ——— Do ———

know whether my Sheristedar ever detailed his work of Octroi duty collections to the accused.

The Sheristedar's duty assigned by me as his immediate Superior was that he should examine the piece-goods, etc, Compare them with the parties produced by the merchants etc, and to record the Correct duty thereon x x."

9 The Deputy Commissioner in submitting the records opines as follows.

"8. x x. The Head Gumastas principal duty was to check the accounts, especially the municipal and Octroi registers etc, while he was preparing the monthly accounts, relating to municipal revenue. He says he did not check these registers, Copied the

figures from the Treasury C accounts. The omission on his part was blameworthy and he was also fined Rs 50" x x x.

" x x I consider he has been exceedingly leniently dealt with."

10 The records now submitted do not contain the Cheistaramie Amildar's Memos dated 1st Augt and 20th Octr 1896 distributing the Office work among his subordinates and the report made to the Dy Comr stating in reply that the Sheristedar has been entrusted with Octroi collections. A draft docket calling for these as well as the municipal Income, Monthly Returns (in Original) received in the President's Office for the

Submitted.

In the copy of the Cheistaramie Amildar's Office order dated 20/10/96 received with the Presidents letter No 5968, 19/10/96 in reply to his Office Docket No 14834 - D 7302 it is stated that the Sheristedar has already been entrusted with the supervision of Octroi collections, and that the Head Gumasta, among other duties in addition to other work entrusted to him, would look after the municipal work with the assistance of the Dy Gumasta.

Municipal Returns for 24 months from July 98 to June 1900 have been signed by the Head Gumasta (Bhaskaraiya) 2 by the Revenue Gumastas and the rest being copies it is not known who had signed the originals.

15/5/02.

the months from July 1898 to July 1900 is put up.

11. Amildar Yello Srinivasa Rao prays that all the faults on his part may be graciously overlooked. He says that he paid his best possible attention to improve the state of things which existed prior to taking over charge of the Chenlamani Taluk, and that in consequence he was able to shew an increase in the Octroi collections before he left the Taluk.

12. On the explanation submitted by Amildar Srinivasa Rao, the Dy Comr has ordered as follows.

"I do not wish to detract anything from the good work done by him in the Taluk. But I am

not prepared to accept his explanation viz: "that in the midst of multifarious duties he could not be expected to do more than what he did in that Taluk."

"2 The records of enquiry conducted by Mr Gopalaswamy, Assistant Commissioner, shew a most disgraceful state of mismanagement. The work of collecting the Abkari duty, remitting the money to the Treasury at the close of each day, and writing up the Chalans, Abkari registers etc were all entrusted to a Gollar, and neither the Sheristedar nor the Amildar exercised any supervision and check to see that the duty was properly performed. The Amildar's excuse that he had entrusted the work to the Sheristedar is lame and

and cannot be accepted. It was not required of him to do the work himself. It would have been sufficient if the vouchers and accounts were checked at least occasionally during his Treasury Inspection, and that he had satisfied himself that his instructions were carried out. His neglect gave the subordinates opportunity to do as they liked, with the consequence that Rs 208/- of municipal money has been mis-appropriated."

"3. The afore said amount must be made good by the Officials who were directly and indirectly responsible."

"4. The Shenstevar and Head Gumasta have each been fined Rs 50/- and the moiety of the amount

must in my opinion be made good by Yello Srinivasa Rao, for his omission."

"5. I do not desire to treat this as a fine, nevertheless it has to be made good by him as the Municipality has lost that sum by negligent conduct or omission on his part."

If the Amildar does not agree to pay the amount, the whole matter will be reported to Govt for orders

12. In submitting the Amildar's report the Dy Comr adds "His explanation and copy of my order thereon are enclosed for favourable perusal"

Submitted for orders with additional

sng 1-30? information collected from the records on the following points

Memo

Fig 01

Asst Secretary's
on the Office
note in re. Appeal
Kaskarayya, Head
Gumasta of the Chinta-
mani Taluk against
der of the Dy Coll.
Dist, fining him
Rs. in Connection with
embezzlement of
ton Revenue in the
Chintamani Town

Queries

Not the monthly
nuts prepared by
Head Gumasta based
the Treasury accounts,
(ii) how is the Head Gu-
masta responsible for
ecting the Collections.

Answers.

(i) Yes, Sir. The Head Gu
masta or some other Gu
masta under him pre
pares the returns drawing
the same on the Treasury Acco
or municipal Cash account
(ii) The Head Gumasta
does not appear responsible; but the
Taluk Sheristedar, who o
duties supervising the collectio
is solely responsible

there anything in the 2 Yes, Sir Please see
to shew this (viz that copy of Dy Coll's order
tion Octor should not Rs 75 Dy 27 7 91 (Re el
to minor Officials) Memo dt 2 No 576 D 11

This has been the practice. Octroi is not based on January figures. It is only levied and recovered then and there and credited to the Treasury. The Octroi Officer (viz the Sheristedar who was in charge of Octroi Collections) is responsible for the recovery of the duty in full and its credit into the Treasury.

3. Is this correct? (Or the monthly returns are prepared on the daily realizations credited in the Treasury but not on the lists of goods on which duty has been collected)

In the present instance the Sheristedar had taken the Golkar as his clerk for attending to the Octroi work, and was getting the daily Collections credited to the Treasury through him. Under these circumstances the Head Gumasta cannot be held responsible.

4 Is the Head Accountant (Gumasta) not responsible for the Treasury credits?

Is this correct (viz that the Head Gumasta was in charge of the Octroi collections)? Do the records show that he was in charge of the Octroi collections

No, Sir

at is the practice
er places?

From enquiries made of two Taluk Sheristedars, each of whom has put in about 18 to 19 years service as Taluk Sheristedars, and one of whom retired a couple of years ago, it is learnt that the practice is generally to prepare the Octroi monthly returns leaving the figures on every day credits made into the Treasury. If necessary ~~corrections~~ information on this point may be called for from either of Kadur, Tumkur or Chitaldroog Districts.

The Municipal monthly returns and Copies thereof submitted by the Presidents shew that the Head Gumasta did not prepare the monthly returns in

of the other Quartas.
prepared them, and
that the Head Quarta
signed these Statements
after Satisfying him-
self as to their correct-
ness on comparing
them with the Treasury
Accounts. Such
being the case it
cannot be said that the
Head Quarta was
wrong in not check-
ing the monthly returns
with the Pattis filed
in the Office.

Submitted to D.P.C.L.,
on 7.6.02.

Seen to the 3rd Counsellor
7/7/02

Chief Commissioner

76

Submitted to the Dewan with draft

21/8/1902

5602

RD 21.VIII.02

(Draft Approved by the Dewan with additions as regards Anildas Yello Srinivas Rao).

Draft Endorsement to Pesh Submitted

8/9/02

1900-02 2421.

N

FILE NO 44 of 00 No. 2898

(1)

Name of Petitioner Bhaskarsah
Head Gumasta

Village } Chintamani
Taluk }

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 22-6-01

Date of Receipt 26-6-01

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Two.

ABSTRACT

Appeals against the Dy: order Commr. fining him Rs 50, in connection with octroi embezzlem

Petr. urges that he was no looking after the octroi accou That the Dy: Commr. by No. 75 27-7-96 ordered That the oc work should be looked after the Amildar or the Sheristed and Govt. Proceedings Nos. 1038-42 / R.T.129-95 & 24502-6 / R 7165-94 & 20-7-9 & 27-6-95 respectively

been passed into the same

That on 1-8-96 the Amil passed a memo directing octroi work to be looked by the Sheristedar and submitted a report No. 1138 -11-97 to the Dy. Coll^r. to that effect; That subsequently Amil. Kanthirava char also sub. a report No. 261/6-9-00 to the Asst coll^r stating That Sheristedar has been doing said duties; That this fact also been satisfactorily proved held in connection with this case criminal enquiry before Fenl: Asst: Coll^r.; That it come to the notice of Fenl. Asst. coll^r That embezzlement is being practised connection with octroi collection, Pet^r was ordered to see whether the amount collected shown from the signed lists possession of the merchants,

Petn No 2898 of 22-6-01.

has duly been remitted to the Treasury; That on examination it was found That one year Rs 1904 odd had been embezzled; that Thereupon the lists (copy) in possession of the Sheristedar, Those with the merchants, the Treasury credits and the accounts prepared by Petr under the guidance of the Dy: Munshi were all compared with one another That the following discrepancies were found out:—

1. Some amounts as shewn to have been collected, from the lists possessed by merchants bearing Sheristedar signatures, were not remitted to the Treasury, and not entered in the Sheristedar's Cash.

2 The amounts shewn the merchants' lists Tal

with those shewn in the Sheristedar's book (which is copy of the original), & the figures in the latter tampered with and the amt reduced and bore the signature of the Sheristedar.

3. Of the amounts collected on one day ~~some~~ a portion was remitted and the balance not.

That the Sheristedar deposed before the Asst: Comr that the work was being looked after by the petr., who is responsible for the fault; That in the Criminal enquiry held in connection with the same case against Narayana Reddi, Golla, The Sheristedar has deposed differently; That the Sheristedar has also been fined, for submitting false accounts in Connection with Tank repairs That the Dy: Comr

without holding any enquiry passed the order appealed against merely on the report of the Asst Commr; That his application for review was not considered at all; That the Dy. Commr finds fault with him for not having checked the office lists by comparing them with the original ones, before entering the amounts in the monthly returns; That there is no connection between the preparation of monthly returns and the embezzlement carried on, in every day transactions; That he could not check the accounts in the possession of the Sheristedar, who is his superior and who was entrusted with the work; That the vouchers and the registers were always with

Cheristedar and There are
in Thes very case to shew
he refused to Give The
ters to peon even for some
work; that there would
been no use even if he
compared the vouchers
submitting monthly re-
as the embezzlement
detected only on compari.
with The 'asal' original
; That the monthly
are prepared from
'Rowwar' accounts; That
accounts prepared by the
'ipal officials were com
with the Treasury ac-
and initialed sometimes
sometimes by Head
and sometimes by
Gumasta; That in
monthly returns
is neither time nor
for ascertaining the
The vouchers which

Petn No 2898 & 22-6-07.

were duly signed by the Sheristeda
That he has been entrusted
with no particular kind of
work as in other Taluks; that
he has merely to wait upon
the Amildar and do such
work as he is asked to do;
That anonymous petns were
coming every now and then,
stating that embezzlement
was being carried on in
octroi collections; That no
notice was taken upon
on Sheristedar's representation
those petns thinking that
petr was at the bottom of
it, as he wants to take
up the work himself from
the Sheristedar; That he has
put in a service of 30 years
and has never been pun-
-ished in this manner

order may be set aside.

Petr states that he has submitted an unauthenticated copy of the order appealed against, as no reply was received to his copy applications dt 7-5-07, 17-5-07 & 2-6-07)

Enc. 1. Wz: covers Instr No. 3051 dt 30-4-07 in 4-5-07 forming Petr that the case cannot be reopened & that he may appeal to Court.

2. Wz Court's order dt 2-2-07 appealed against

SM
8/7/07.

[illegible] ೨೯೯೮ (೧)

2898 [illegible]
20 - 6 - 1901 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1901 [illegible] 22 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (50) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 3051 [illegible]

[illegible] 7-5-01 [illegible]

[illegible] 17-5-01 [illegible]

[illegible] 2-6-01 [illegible]

[illegible]

ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟುಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ವಾಣಿಜ್ಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1961 ರ ಕಲಂ 4 ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಂದಾಯಿಸಲು ಅರ್ಜಿ

ಸೇವೆ

ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟುಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ವಾಣಿಜ್ಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1961 ರ ಕಲಂ 4 ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಂದಾಯಿಸಲು ಅರ್ಜಿ

ಸೇವೆ

ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟುಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ವಾಣಿಜ್ಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1961 ರ ಕಲಂ 4 ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಂದಾಯಿಸಲು ಅರ್ಜಿ

ಸೇವೆ

ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟುಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ವಾಣಿಜ್ಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1961 ರ ಕಲಂ 4 ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಂದಾಯಿಸಲು ಅರ್ಜಿ

ಸೇವೆ

ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಯ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಹಳ ಆಳವಾಗಿ ಬೀರಿದೆ. ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದ ಅನುವಾದಗಳೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದ್ದವು. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಪುರಾಣ, ಕಾವ್ಯ, ನಾಟಕ ಮುಂತಾದ ಪ್ರಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಂತಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಆದಿಕವಿ ಪಂಪನು ಮಹಾಭಾರತವನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇವಲ ಅನುವಾದವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡದೆ ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಪ್ರತಿಭೆಯಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಸ ರೂಪ ಕೊಟ್ಟನು. ಅರ್ಜುನನನ್ನು ಪಂಪನು ತನ್ನ ಆದರ್ಶ ಪುರುಷನಾಗಿ ಚಿತ್ರಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಇದು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಮೂಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಹೊಸ ಕಲ್ಪನೆ.

ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಅಲಂಕಾರ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರವು ಕನ್ನಡ ಕವಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶಿಯಾಯಿತು. ಉಪಮೆ, ರೂಪಕ, ಯಮಕ, ಶ್ಲೇಷ ಮುಂತಾದ ಅಲಂಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡ ಕವಿಗಳು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಿಂದ ಕಲಿತರು. ಆದರೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಕವಿಗಳು ಈ ಅಲಂಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡದ ಸ್ವಭಾವಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಬಳಸಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಕನ್ನಡದ ಜನಪದ ಗಾದೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ನುಡಿಗಟ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕವಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೊಗಸಾಗಿ ಬಳಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಪ್ರಭಾವದಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಂಪೂ ಕಾವ್ಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬೆಳೆಯಿತು. ಗದ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಪದ್ಯ ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಬಳಸಿ ಬರೆಯುವ ಈ ಶೈಲಿಯು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಿಂದ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಪಂಪ, ರನ್ನ, ಪೊನ್ನ ಮುಂತಾದ ಕವಿಗಳು ಚಂಪೂ ಕಾವ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪಂಡಿತರಾಗಿದ್ದರು.

ಆದರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಪ್ರಭಾವವು ಕೆಲವೊಮ್ಮೆ ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾನಿಕರವಾಗಿಯೂ ಪರಿಣಮಿಸಿತು. ಕೆಲವು ಕವಿಗಳು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಅತಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಳಸಿ ಕನ್ನಡದ ಸೊಗಡನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡರು. ಇಂತಹ ಕಾವ್ಯಗಳು ಜನಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಯಿತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಪ್ರಭಾವವನ್ನು ಸಮತೋಲನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತವು ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪಾರವಾದ ಕೊಡುಗೆಯನ್ನು ನೀಡಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಕವಿಗಳು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಿಂದ ಕಲಿತದ್ದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಶೈಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಳಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಕನ್ನಡದ ಸ್ವಂತಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಇದೇ ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದ ಶ್ರೇಷ್ಠತೆಗೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣ

ಸಹೋದರರೇ,

ಇಂದು ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವುದು ಒಂದು ಮಹತ್ವದ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ. ಕಳೆದ ಕೆಲವು ತಿಂಗಳುಗಳಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ನಡುವೆ ಕೆಲವು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಉಂಟಾಗಿವೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೂ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇದು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳು ಮುಚ್ಚಿದರೆ ಮಾಲೀಕರಿಗೆ ನಷ್ಟ, ಕೆಲಸ ನಿಂತರೆ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಕುಟುಂಬಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಕಷ್ಟ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಂದು ನಾವು ಕುಳಿತು ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಹಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಮೊದಲಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಗಮನವಿಟ್ಟು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ, ಕೆಲಸದ ಅವಧಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ, ಕೂಲಿ ಏರಿಕೆಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಡಿಯುವ ನೀರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಶ್ರಾಂತಿ ಕೊಠಡಿಯಂತಹ ಮೂಲಭೂತ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇವು ನ್ಯಾಯಯುತವಾದ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳೆಂದು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ದಿನವಿಡೀ ದುಡಿದು ಸಂಜೆ ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುವಾಗ ಸುಸ್ತಾಗಿರಬಾರದು, ಅವನಿಗೆ ಗೌರವಯುತವಾದ ಬದುಕು ಸಿಗಬೇಕು.

ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದಲೂ ಕೆಲವು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾದ ಅಂಶಗಳಿವೆ. ಬಾಡಿಗೆ, ವಿದ್ಯುತ್ ಬಿಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸರಕುಗಳ ಬೆಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಾಭ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಅವರ ವಾದ. ಕೆಲವು ಸಣ್ಣ ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ಕೂಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿದರೆ ತಾವು ಬಾಗಿಲು ಮುಚ್ಚಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೆದರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಭಯವನ್ನೂ ನಾವು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕೂಲಿಯನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ಸಲ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುವ ಬದಲು ಮೂರು ಹಂತಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಮೊದಲ ಹಂತ ಮುಂದಿನ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಿಂದ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರಲಿ. ಅಷ್ಟರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಲಾಭ-ನಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ಸರಿಹೊಂದಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಮಯ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೆಲಸದ ಅವಧಿಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿದಿನ ಎಂಟು ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಕೆಲಸ ಮತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆ ಊಟದ ವಿರಾಮ ಎಂಬ ನಿಯಮವನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಪಾಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಕೂಲಿ ನೀಡಬೇಕು.

ಕುಡಿಯುವ ನೀರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಶ್ರಾಂತಿ ಕೊಠಡಿಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಮುಲಾಜಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವು ಐಷಾರಾಮಿ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಗಳು. ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಸಣ್ಣ ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ಕೊಡಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕಾಯದೆ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ತಕ್ಷಣ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಈ ಒಪ್ಪಂದವನ್ನು ಮುರಿದವರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಲೀಕರು, ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರು ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಂದವನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲಂಘಿಸಿದರೆ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಮುಂದೆ ದೂರು ನೀಡಬಹುದು. ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಎರಡೂ ಕಡೆಯವರ ಅಹವಾಲನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಯುತ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸಹೋದರರೇ, ಈ ಒಪ್ಪಂದ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಎರಡೂ ಕಡೆಯವರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತ್ಯಾಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾರೂ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಗೆಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಯಾರೂ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಸೋಲಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಗೆದ್ದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಗೆಲ್ಲುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ನೆನಪಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮುಂದಿನ ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಇಡೋಣ.

16

[illegible] 94 [illegible]

2377
18-6-94

[illegible]

9

8 91

ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ ಮೂವತ್ತು (30) ದಿನಗಳ ಒಳಗಾಗಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಲಿಖಿತ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬಹುದು. ಅಂತಹ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂತಿಮಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಅಂತಿಮ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗಾಗಿ ಲಭ್ಯವಿರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಲಾದ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಯಾವುದೇ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದೊಳಗೆ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಆ ಭಾಗವು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನದಿಂದ ಮುಕ್ತವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ಭೂಮಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾರುಕಟ್ಟೆ ಮೌಲ್ಯದ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಪರಿಹಾರ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರಿಗೆ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಜಮಾ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ಭೂಮಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳು ಅಥವಾ ಮರಗಳು ಇದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅವುಗಳಿಗೂ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಪರಿಹಾರ ಮೊತ್ತದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಯಾವುದೇ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲಂಘಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಕಾನೂನು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಕುರಿತು ಯಾವುದೇ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟನೆಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ ಕಚೇರಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹಿತಾಸಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯು ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾದ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಕುರಿತು ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯವನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಯಾವುದೇ ಭಾಗವು ಅಸಿಂಧುವಾದಲ್ಲಿ, ಉಳಿದ ಭಾಗಗಳು ಯಥಾವತ್ತಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಕುರಿತು ಯಾವುದೇ ಸಲಹೆಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ ಕಚೇರಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಿತಾಸಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯು ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾದ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಕುರಿತು ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯವನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಯಾವುದೇ ಭಾಗವು ಅಸಿಂಧುವಾದಲ್ಲಿ, ಉಳಿದ ಭಾಗಗಳು ಯಥಾವತ್ತಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಕುರಿತು ಯಾವುದೇ ಸಲಹೆಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ ಕಚೇರಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು.

2-8-

9-7-01

Referred to Local Branch in continuation.

5/01

No. 281

Name of Petitioner Bhaskariah, Head Gumasta of the Chintaman

Village

Taluk Taluk

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 20-7-01

Date of Receipt 23-7-01

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure One

ABSTRACT

In continuation of his appeal petition dated 24-6-01, the petitioner submits the Dy: Com'rs order dated 11-2-01 fining petitioner Rs 50/- for being negligent in checking certain accounts.

Dasp
1/8/10.

MGCPB—23-5-01—3,000

ಪ್ರಿಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರೆ,

ನಮಸ್ಕಾರ. ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನೀವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕುಶಲವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕುಶಲವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಚಳಿಗಾಲ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿದೆ. ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ರಾತ್ರಿ ಚಳಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಗಲು ಬಿಸಿಲು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮಳೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಳೆಗಾಲ ಮುಗಿದಿದೆ. ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಮಳೆಗಾಲ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಮಳೆ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಕೆರೆಗಳು ತುಂಬಿದ್ದವು. ಬೆಳೆಗಳು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆದಿದ್ದವು. ರೈತರು ಸಂತೋಷವಾಗಿದ್ದರು.

ನಾನು ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಪಾಠ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಕ್ಕಳು ತುಂಬಾ ಚುರುಕಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಲಿಯುವ ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ಇದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪಾಠ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಖುಷಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರಿಂದ ನಾನೂ ಕಲಿಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಮುಂದಿನ ತಿಂಗಳು ನಾನು ಊರಿಗೆ ಬರಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸುಮಾರು ಹತ್ತು ದಿನ ರಜೆ ಸಿಗಬಹುದು. ಆಗ ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಭೇಟಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು. ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಊಟ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹಳೆಯ ನೆನಪುಗಳನ್ನು ಮೆಲುಕು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕಾಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ನೀವು ಯಾವಾಗ ಬರುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿ. ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿ ಒಂದು ದಿನ ಪಿಕ್ನಿಕ್ ಹೋಗೋಣ. ಹಳೆಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರೆಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಕರೆಯೋಣ. ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಗುಂಪಾಗಿ ಹೋಗೋಣ. ಖುಷಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಲ ಕಳೆಯೋಣ.

ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ನನ್ನ ನಮಸ್ಕಾರ ತಿಳಿಸಿ. ಚಿಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರೀತಿ. ಹಿರಿಯರಿಗೆ ನಮಸ್ಕಾರ. ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲು ಮರೆಯಬೇಡಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪತ್ರಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕಾಯುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರೀತಿಯ,

2-303-9

MYSORE DE 'S OFFICE.

LOCAL BOARDS BRANCH.

(3)

SECTION

FILE No. 44 of 00 R.L. 505

3.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition is Registered No. 2898 & 2781 dated 22nd June & 24 July 1901 & 2421 & 203 received at the Dewan's Office from Bhaskar Rao Head Gumasta, Chintamani Taluk, Kolar District, Appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner fining the petitioner Rs 50/- in connection with the the enhancement of Octroi Revenue in the Chintamani Municipality, are forwarded, together with their two and one enclosures respectively to the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, for report

By order,

Dfd as per order on the slip

28/9/'01.

Secretary.

BANGALORE,

28th September 1901

MGCPB—19-7-01—250.

(General Series No. 30.)

SECTION Miscl

FILE No. 44 of 00

4

OFFICE OF
9114
23-1-02
1902
SECRETARY OF

L 1184

6

From I. E. C. Caine Esqre
Deputy Commissioner
Malay District

To
H. V. Cranfurd Esqre
Secretary to the Government
of Singapore

Dated 14th January 1902.

Despatched 18

Received

General No. C. 119 } 1902.
No.

Enclosures Number. 2 on file of records

Submitting with records a detailed report regarding the defalcation in the Penang Treasury.

Rev 21/1

This is in connection with Municipal Rev: the papers may be transferred

N. 1. 2

H. 2. 02

Draft to other Ranges 23/1/02
HGK

No. C. 1249

Kolar Deputy Commissioners
Camp: Bowringpet
14th January 1902.

From,

V. E. C. Ganu Esqre

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To,

M. V. Rangacharya Esqre
Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Revenue and
General Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for the information of Government, records relating to the misappropriation of a sum of Rs: 238-6-5 being the octroi duty levied on piece goods brought into the Chintamani Municipality.

The facts of the case are briefly as follows:—

(1) On the receipt of some anonymous petitions complaining that octroi duty was not being properly

ght into account, that the Shrildar, one Gollar. Varadu Reddi and the Daroga were dividing the income among themselves, the Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Taluk appears to have been requested by my predecessor Mr B R. Venkatavaradiengar to enquire into this matter. The assistant Commissioner held some preliminary enquiry and reported against the Gollar, whereupon Mr Venkatavaradiengar ordered that the Gollar should be suspended forthwith and that a fresh meeting should be made of the Taluk Panchayet accounts.

2 The Accounts Commissioner (Mr Gopalen,) declared vide his note No 221 dated 3rd January 1911 enclosed with

to have carefully compared the duplicate patties produced in the Valuk Cutcherry by the merchants, with the Octroi registers and their account books, such as Rozanda Khirdi.—

3. From July 1898 upto the end of June 1899 viz: one year. Rupees 232-13-4 are found to have been misappropriated. In some cases, the total value upon which the duty is leviable has been altered and the figures showing the amount of duty paid have been similarly tampered with, thereby showing that the correct amounts were entered in the first instance and were subsequently altered, the difference being misappropriated. In other cases the amounts recovered have been

omitted wholly or partially from being brought into account.

4 The explanations of all the Officials concerned were taken, and Mr. Gopalingam concluded that Gollar Varadu Reddi was the person primarily responsible for this nefarious transaction, and that the higher Taluk Officials had also failed to exercise due control over him.

5 After perusing all the proceedings in the case, I passed the order No. 878 dated 12th February 1920 Vide Index No. 1.

6 The persons who were principally responsible for the Octroi collections were the Tahsildar and the Taluk Sheristadar. One of the duties of these officers were required to keep the Octroi seal in their custody, and stamp all the goods in the [illegible]

By the these officers have other work
to attend to in addition to this
audition not unusual that they
ask their subordinate officials to
calculate the duty recoverable on
each patty (list), write up the
challan for payment to the treasury,
and enter up the Octroi register &c.
In this Tāluk the Sheristēdar, the
Head Gumasta and the Gollar
appear to have been actually
in charge of this work From the
way in which the patties had been
altered, it was morally certain that
the Gollar had taken advantage of
the confidence placed in him by
the Sheristedar, and his failure
the latter's
to exercise even the ordinary super-
vision that was required of him,
allowed opportunities to the Gollar
to gradually increase the sums of
misappropriation. This laxity on

part of the Taluk Sheristedar, was noticed by the Huzildar Yella Srinivasa Rau - now Huzildar of Gorebidanur. -

7 Concerning in the opinion of the deviation Commissioner, I ordered the prosecution of the following Reddy. The records relating to this case, and copy of the Chief Court's judgment setting aside the Conviction are herewith enclosed.

8 I have fined the Sheristedar Rs. 50/- and have transferred him from that Taluk to Chickballapur as a punishment. The Head Sunastas principal duty was to check the accounts, especially the Municipal and Octroi registers etc, while he was preparing the monthly accounts relating to Municipal revenues. He did not do so the

copied the figures from the accounts. The omission on his part was blameworthy and he was also fined Rs: 50/-.

2. The Amildar could not also be exonerated from the blame. As a responsible officer of the Taluk, he ought to have at least occasionally scrutinized the work of his subordinates. He was therefore asked to show cause why he should not be fined Rs. 100/- towards the recouppment of the amount lost by the Municipality. In his explanation, he tries to be exempted from the blame, by stating that he had multifarious works to attend to, and that he had shown an increase in the octroi collections also, before he left the Taluk. His explanation

and copy of my order thereon are enclosed for favorable perusal.

10 If the order for recovering the said amount is approved, the money will be credited towards the Municipal revenues.—

11 I regret that there was a delay in the submission of this report as I wished to wait till the result of the Criminal case was known, and as the records connected with the case, were for some months before the Assistant Commissioner and 1st class magistrate and afterwards before the Chief Court for revision, and were only returned recently.—

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient
[illegible]

5 Z

In the Chief Court of Mysore, Bangalore

Friday, the 6th day of December 1901

Present

Hon'ble Justice, J W Best Chief Judge

and

Hon'ble Justice T Narahari Rao, Judge

Revision Case No 46 of 1901-02

Docket No 242
dtd 13-9-1901

In the matter of a reference from the District Magistrate of Kolar in the case of Narayana Reddy, accused in criminal case No 44 of 1900-01 on the file of the Assistant Commissioner and 1st Class Magistrate of Chintamani Div

Order

For the offence of criminal breach of trust by a servant, the punishment under section 408 of the Penal code, imprisonment of either description

Record returned with this Office
No 4175 dt 13-11-01
2711

which may extend to seven years - to which a fine may be added

Imprisonment must be awarded. The Magistrate's order imposing a fine only is therefore illegal and if the conviction can be upheld, a sentence of imprisonment will have to be passed either in substitution of, or in addition to the fine imposed by the Magistrate. But it is contended on behalf of the accused that the conviction is wrong.

It is to be regretted that the Magistrate did not add a notice to the fine imposed by him, or a nominal sentence of imprisonment, at least, to enable the accused to prefer an appeal. By the sentence passed, he has precluded from appealing

Having considered the evidence in the case, we do not think the conviction can be upheld. There is

of the 7th, 8th and 10th witnesses that they found these particular amounts, viz (1) Rs. 2-7-0 (2) Re 1/- and (3) annas six and pies three into the accused's hands, is not at all convincing. But assuming that they remember the fact, 7th witness says the payment was made "in the presence of the Sheristadar". 10th witness, gives as his reason for saying as above that accused was "working after the Petrol work". It is clear from the evidence of the Taluk officials examined as witnesses for the prosecution that the accused who was merely a Peon, used to sit near the Sheristadar and work under his supervision

The mere fact of the Challans being in the hand writing of the accused proves nothing. The Sheristadar's statement that the papers were drawn "

accused's boxes is contradicted by evidence of the Head and Vasadi Gumastas, 3rd and 5th witnesses for the prosecution, from which it is seen that the accused had no box of his own

We therefore set aside the conviction and sentence passed on the accused and direct that the fine, if levied, be refunded to him.

A true Copy
/Sd/ M Clapham
for Registrar

"Copy"

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To,

The Sub Divisional Officer,
Chickaballapura

Respected Sir,

I beg to represent my grievance respectfully as follows with reference to Superintendent's order No. 880. dated 12th instant from Panath. —

I request I am unable to submit my explanation called for under. I am put in possession of the particulars of records which has led to my explanation being called for.

To my knowledge I have never been convicted by magistrate in the due discharge of my duties during the long period of 30 years of service, but I am of opinion of the

When I have issued both the ministerial as well as executive official orders by virtue of the copies of Government Proceedings thereto attached.

With regard to the buildings of the Taluk Cutchery I found, while I was there, my best possible attention to improve the state of things existed prior to my taking over charge of the Taluk and found the same much improved, more especially on point of Police collection, before I left the Taluk.

Moreover in pursuance of the orders contained in Government Proceedings No 1038-42 dated 20th July 1896 read from arrangements were made by me and the work was entrusted to the Shanbogs whom I used to instruct occasionally, to attend to Revenue business himself personally and not to delegate this responsibility to his menial servants or to the ryots. Thus I

of Irrigation right, by the
three Commissioners in accordance with 1877
enclosing therein a comparative
statement to show the financial
state of things in consequence of the
arrangements made by me.

I need not add here that I,
in the midst of my multifarious
duties, can hardly be expected to do
more than a hasty and
-mini examination of general results
-vious and must [illegible] me
-to personally check the details accounts
in detail by comparing the vouchers
therewith [illegible]

Notwithstanding this I
humbly submit for consideration of the Deputy
Commissioner and Director that I should
submit my explanation in the
matter & humbly beg to submit that
I may be furnished with a list of
Papers in re. Certain expenditure
in the Chinkara [illegible]

29 Begging to be excused
for going lengthy representation
I beg to remain
Sir
Sd/- V. Srinivasa Row
Amildar

Reference:- Docket No 614 dated
23rd February 1901 from the Sub
Division officer Chickaballapur
submitting the above explanation
of V. Srinivasa Row.

Order

I have perused the explana-
tion submitted by Vella Srinivasa
Row, in the matter of defalcations
in the Octroi duty in the Chinta-
-mani Municipality.

We deem it hard the best
possible attention to improve the
State of things which existed prior
to his taking charge, and
then in consequence he was able to
show an increase in the Octroi
collections, before he left the Taluk

do not wish to detract anything from the good work done by him in the Taluk. But I am not prepared to accept his explanation viz" that in the midst of multifarious activities he could not be expected to do more than what he did in that Taluk".—

2 The records of enquiries conducted by Mr Govindarajan that I am in possession, show a most disgraceful state of financial affairs. The work of collecting the Revenue duly, remitting the money to the Treasury at the close of each day, and writing up the Cash Book, & other records to be all attended to by a Cashier, under the immediate control & supervision of the Tahsildar, & not the Clerk.

43

and submission to the orders communicated in the above, the under-signed represented his grievances personally to the Deputy Commissioner on the 26th. The orders above noted down with obeisance and resubmitted as directed above with this humble and simple Solicitation viz., that the Sub Division Officer to whom the undersigned is immediately subordinate, may kindly move the Deputy Commissioner to graciously overlook all the faults on the part of the undersigned

Cuddapah
26-6-1901

(Sd) G. Srinivasa Rao
Amildar

"Copy"
B. Gurudev
Asst

OFFICE OF THE
9873
23 JAN. 02

1902

SECTION Misc

FILE No. 44 of 00

ITEM No. 5

FROM J. E. B. Carr Esqre
Sheristadar Commissioner's
Kolar District

TO W. Narayanayya Esq.
Secretary to the Govt.
of Mysore.

Dated 24th January/02

Despatched 25

Received

General No C. 135

No.

Enclosure No. 5

Submitting report
re: appeal petition of
Bhavkenakpa, Head
Gumasta, Chintamani
Taluk against the order
of Sheristadar Commissioner
fining him Rs. 100/-

Peh
28/1/02

Encl
J. V. K
29/1/02

Memo and draft docket jukn

HBK
1.3.02

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's
Camp Vengal —
Dated 24th January 1902

From,

C.T. E. b Cave Esqre
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To,

N. Y. Narayana Esqre
Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, General Revenue
Department.

Sir,

With reference to Government
Official Memorandum No. 5515
dated 28th September 1901 forwarding for report
petition of Bhaskaraha, Head Gumasta,
Chintamani Taluk appealing against
this Office order imposing a fine of Rs. 50/-,
I have the honor to invite attention to
my letter No. 1249 dated 1249 dated 16th
Instant and to state that the Head
Gumasta was fined for his gross and
culpable negligence in not having
checked the accounts while purchasing

Municipal Demand, Collection and Balance accounts and other returns.

The Assistant Commissioner's report No 221 dated 8th January 1901 and my letter to Government quoted above explain the circumstances of the case.-

The enclosures of the memo under reply are submitted herewith. I consider he has been exceedingly liberally dealt with.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner
Kola, District

SECTION Miscl
FILE No 44 of 1902
6

4

The President of the Municipalities in the Kolar District

Dated 7/3/02

No 14834
Ch 303-96

His letter No C 1356 dt the 24th January 1902.

With reference to the above, has the honour to request that the marginally noted records may be submitted to this Office at a very early date.

By Order

FB
4/3/1902
Asst Secretary
FB 3/2/02

Chintamani Ambaji's Memos dated 1.8.96 and 20.10.96 distributing his Office work among his subordinates.

Dy Comr or President's order No 75 27.7.96 to the Chintamani Ambaji.

Chintamani Ambaji's Report No 1138 & 5.11.97 to the Dy Comr

Do report No 261 & 6.5.00 to the General Asstt Comr

Genl Asstt Comr's order No 2447 No 2377 & the 18th June '94.

Chintamani Town Municipal Revenue monthly Statements (in original) submitted by the Vice-President of the Chintamani Munty for the months from July 1898 to June 1900

13681 1902 1809

From F. E. Barnes Esqr
Resident &c

To H. W. Hanjindiah Esqr
Secretary & the Govt of the Jeeva
Pers & Govt by the

Dated 19th April 1902
Despatched 25th "
Received
General No. 596
No.

Enclosure No. 24 accts & Rpt

Submitting the Jeeva Municipal
Octroi Revenue Accounts
of the Octroi Revenue in the
Thoothoocoody Taluq &c

for the year 1901-02

No 333 dated 19/4/02

L 2
26.4.02

29

Office of the President of
Municipalities Hon'ble &c
dated 19th April 17
Camp Chickballa

From

J. E. Carr Esq.

President

To

H. V. Ranganadiah Esq.

Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Revenue & General Depts

Sir,

Adverting to your docket No 14834
& 7.303-96
dated the 7th March 1902, I have the honor
to submit herewith the records called for
in the above

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

J. E. Carr
President

Encl. Form 7

12.50

Chingleput — 1-8-1896

To

The Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Madras

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the Tahsildar of Tiruvallur has been appointed Deputy Collector and Joint Magistrate of Chingleput and that he has been directed to join his appointment on the 9th instant. I have the honour to request that the Tahsildar of Tiruvallur may be relieved of his charge on the 8th instant in order that he may have sufficient time to join his appointment on the 9th instant.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Signed) Hullo. Sreenivasa Row
for Mr. Henderson
Head Assistant

Order. 20-10-1896.

(Signed) Yelleswarapu Rao

(Copy)

H. Prasada Rao

To President

53

192

261

(signed) Yello Sreenivasa Rao

(Copy)

Advocate
for President

53

192

56 13/e

12-4-1894 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 2377 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

18-6-94.

Signed Abdul Aziz

[illegible]

Copy

[illegible]

Read:- 5 (14)

SECTION Three-2

FILE NO 44 of 1901

SERIAL NO 8

Petitions registered 2898 and 281 of 2421 / 203 the 22nd June and 20th July 1901 respectively from Bhaskaraya, Head Gumasta, Chintamani Taluk appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner fining them Rs 50/ in connection with the embezzlement of Octroi Revenue in the Chintamani Town

2. Letter No C 1249/1356 of the 24th January 1902 from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar Distt Submitting detailed report regarding the embezzlement of Octroi Revenue above referred to

3 Letter No C 1356 of the 24th January 1902 from the Sirsta Officer reporting his

with reference to this Office Memorandum No 5515 L-F 303-96 of the 28th September 1901, that the Head Gumasta was fined for his gross and culpable negligence in not having checked the accounts while preparing the Municipal Demand, Collection and Balance Accounts, and other returns; and stating that he considers that the Head Gumasta has been exceedingly leniently dealt with.

4. letter No 596 of the 19th April 1902 from the same Officer, submitting the copies of records called for in this Office Docket No 14834 / L-F 303-96 of the 7th Mar 02

4 R.L. 4v°

Order thereon No 3335-7 *
L-F 303-96
D 9/9/1902 *

From the records

(1) Pu: Case No 44 of 1901-1901 in the file of the General Asst: Commr: & Ist-Class Magistrate Chintadrupi Division

(2) 24 Municipal Accounts from the returns of Chintadrupi Municipality from pp 1-18

received in the case
is clear that the Head
Gumasta cannot in any
way be held answerable
for the embezzlement of
the Municipal funds, as
his work was confined to
the preparation of accounts
based on cash payments
credited to the Treasury
accounts This point
is not disputed either by
the Amildar (Yellu Srinivas Rau) or the Sheristedar (M. Subba Rau) but it is not so
in the case of the latter
however, apparent. The case of the Taluk
He was put in charge
of the Cotton collection by
a written order from
the Amildar, who appears
to have reported the same
to his Superior Officers.
The Sheristedar, however
satisfied himself by
entrusting the whole of
his responsible work
to the Gumasta. But as

Seal under cover to accompany
Record of Proceedings
Returned to Court
1 Exhibit
Date
9/9/11

to have been exercised by him on this low paid official. The result was a sum of Rs 238-6-5 was misappropriated by the Gollapa. To screen his offence, the Gollapa is reported to have destroyed some of the accounts also. In the Criminal prosecution, ~~the Gollapa~~ he was acquitted by the Chief Court on appeal, though the Govt Asstt Counsel and 1st Class Magistrate Mr C. Krishna Rao convicted and sentenced him to pay a fine of Rs 500/ under Sec. 408 of the Indian Penal Code, the Charge being misappropriation of three items of Octroi revenue amounting in all to Rs 3-13-3.

2. The Gollapa official, it is presumed, has been dismissed ~~the~~

Municipality of Vizagapatam 1898

the Service. The punish
ment awarded to the Talukdy
Sheristedar is a fine of
Rs 50/-, Same as that
inflicted on the Head
Gumasta, and transfer
to another Taluk. The
Govt observe that the
Taluk Sheristedar, was
was very leniently dealt
with. ~~He should have~~
~~been reduced to the grade~~
~~of a Head Gumasta for~~
~~culpable negligence of~~
~~his work~~ and he should
Mr Amuldas and the Sheristedar
be required to make
good the amt recovered in
balance, if any, of the
embezzled money in the
proportion of one-third and
two thirds
3.2. The fine inflicted
on the Head Gumasta
is remitted.

3.3. The Amuldar (Yeh
Seeneva Rau) is greatly
to blame for his

appointed of all
misdemeanours
by his predecessor
Venkatasubbiah
cannot be deemed
absolve him from
liability to s
personally on the
embezzlement which
-curred. He is therefore
enjoined to give to
the amount due from
his sureties, any

Who deserved to be
degraded to the
position of a Head
Gumasta,

The defalcations extended
over a period of nearly
ten months from August
98 to June 99 and in
this long interval
Yelloo Seeneva Rau
does not seem to have
once checked the
accounts which appa-
-rently were so badly
kept that a superficial
examination could
not have failed to
detect the fraud which
was being practised
with perfect impunity
and apparent freedom
from any fear and
regardless of consequences.
He cannot under the
circumstances be

to Scruti

c tion entrusted

his ub .Sf

head / cally Com-

the counts with

ittan ase to the

the and

he

have been

BV
21/8/02

Secretary
20/8/02

31.VIII 02

To

The Dy Comr and Regd.
of the Mulkies, Kolar
Dist returning the
entire records.

The Supdt of Rev Survey
in Mysore for comu.
munication to Mr.
Yello Srinivas Rao.

The Comptroller
in Mysore

Issue

1/9

to Mysore, Kolar Dist)

No. 4111
L. F. 303-96

SECTION 95 62

FILE No 21 / MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
LOCAL BOARDS BRANCH.

The 18/9/02 189

Re: Three
R. Lr. 478

ENDORSEMENT granted to Bhaskarayya, Head Gumasta, Chintamani Taluk Office,

in reply to his Petitions Registered Nos 2898 & 281 / 2421 & 203 dated the 22nd June and 20th July 1901 reply appealing against the order of the Dy Comr, Kolar Dist, fining him Rs 50/- in connection with the embezzlement of Octroi Revenue in the Chintamani Town.

Petitioner is informed that Government are pleased to remit the fine of Rs 50/- inflicted on him. The enclosures to his petitions are returned.

14/9/1902
for Secretary.